

# Exiles from History

by David McCalden

## The Holocaust

Holocausts, we are told, are nothing new to the Jews. They have been suffering regular extermination programs since time began. First the Egyptians and the Persians, then the Romans, then the Spanish, then the Russians, then the Nazis, and today the Arabs. As the candid Jewish psychohistorian Dr. Howard F. Stein wrote in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1980:

*"For the Jews, the term 'holocaust' does not simply denote a single catastrophic era in history, but is a grim metaphor for **the meaning of Jewish history**. The 'Holocaust' lies at the heart of the Jewish experience of time itself. One is either anxiously awaiting persecution, experiencing persecution, recovering from it, or living in a period that is a temporary reprieve from it.*

*"'Holocaust' is thus the timeless fabric into which the 1933-1945 period is woven... Thus the 'reality' of the Holocaust is inextricably part of the myth in which it is woven — and for which myth it serves as further confirmatory evidence for the timeless Jewish theme that the world is in conspiracy to annihilate them, one way or another, at least eventually."*

Indeed, the Jewish perception of many of these "Holocausts" is strikingly synchronous. We can trace the same feature in all of them: "persecution" by anti-Semites, gassings and/or burnings, sexual and toiletry tortures, and general Jewish suffering and torment. The myths tell us more about the tellers than about the subject characters; for many of these tales are totally or partly fictitious. They do not stand up to scientific examination. Let us start at the beginning with the alleged plot by the Persian Prime Minister Haman to exterminate the Jewish population. Every year modern Jews still celebrate Haman's execution, in a festival known as Purim which involves eating pies cooked in the form of human ears. The legend tells us that Haman's plot was foiled when the King (Ahasuerus) took a Jewish bride, Esther, in place of his current Queen, Vashti. Esther was advised by her cousin Mordecai of Haman's plot to kill Persia's entire Jewish population, and so she prevailed upon her husband king to execute Haman, and his ten sons, and some tens of thousands of his followers. However, we read in the *Encyclopedia Judaica* under "Purim":

*"The chronological difficulties such as the identity of king Ahasuerus and the absence of any reference in Persian sources to a king having a Jewish consort; the striking resemblance between the names Mordecai and Esther to the Babylonian gods Marduk and Ishtar; the lack of any reference to Purim in Jewish literature before the first century BC; the language of the Book of Esther — which suggests a later date: all these have moved the critics to look elsewhere than the account in Esther for the true origin of the festival. Various conjectures have been made, but the problem still awaits its solution."*

Esther/Ishtar was a Jewish fertility goddess to whom first-born Jewish children were sacrificed by their own parents. She was part of a pantheon of gods that included Moloch the fire god, in whose fiery, Auschwitzian statue, more Jewish babies were burned alive. In numerous Biblical (Old Testament) passages we find heated debate and condemnation of this practice. Nowadays, Jewish parents do not physically sacrifice their children to an altar of Jewish theology; modern Jewish parents just inculcate sufficient guilt, anxiety and worry into their offspring that the destruction of their psychological self-esteem is a much more punitive (and therefore valuable) offering.

Jewish Talmudic literature offers all sorts of outlandish claims for Jewish casualties in the various Jewish revolts against Roman rule. The revolt in 115-117 AD started in Libya and spread along the coast to Egypt and then to Cyprus. However, in most places the Jews did not attack the Roman administrators or soldiers; they attacked the Greek and Roman civilians. Hundreds of thousands were massacred. In response, the Roman army started killing Jews, and the Talmud tells us that in Alexandria the casualty toll was "sixty myriads on sixty myriads". This would appear to be a total of 1,200,000 — a rather remarkable figure, since Alexandria only had a total, Gentile and Jewish, population of some 500,000.

The next Jewish revolt was in 132 to 135 AD, under the self-proclaimed "Messiah" Bar Kokhba. According to the Talmud, the revolt ended in the Roman laying siege to Bar Kokhba's fortress at Bethar, near Jerusalem. We are told that Bar Kokhba was so tough that he would kick catapulted Roman rocks back at them with his knee. The Roman finally captured the fortress and in revenge killed 4 billion "or as some say" 40 million Jews. In order to reassure us of the authenticity of these figures, the Talmud tells us that a tidal wave of Jewish blood, carrying large boulders with it, stained the sea for a distance of four miles out. The Jewish schoolchildren in Bethar — all 64 million or "as some say" 150,000 — were rolled up individually in their parchment scrolls and burned alive. Slain Jews were used as fence posts, and blood left over from the tidal wave was used to fertilize Roman vineyards for the next seven years. Needless to say, the Roman literature of the time does not even mention any massacre at Bethar. Credulity prevents us from accepting the Talmudic massacre allegations and their death toll. But we do detect a certain amount of synchronicity between these ancient yarns and modern Nazi Holocaust allegations.

As regards the Spanish Inquisition, we have already seen how the Chief Inquisitor and burner of Jews at the stake Fray Tomas de Torquemada was himself a Jew whose

father had feigned conversion to Christianity. Torquemada enrolled the assistance of pious pamphleteer Fray Alonso de Espina in his rabble-rousing activities against Protestants, Jews and other non-Catholics. Espina, besides being a flaming homosexual, was yet another Marrano, or Jewish pretended convert. Torquemada's successor Fray Diego de Deja was also a Christianized Jew. So here again, the Jews can hardly complain about a Spanish "Holocaust" when it was in fact other Jews who were doing the persecuting and Jew-burning. If anyone has a complaint it is surely the Protestants, who were tortured and murdered both by Catholics and by Jews pretending to be Catholics. Some Jews have argued that the recitation of the *Kol Nidre*, or breaking of all vows on Yom Kippur (the Day of Atonement) was necessitated by Jews being forced to adopt Christianity during this period, but of course, *Kol Nidre* was in regular use long before.

Before the Nazi monster came on the scene, the main character in the Jewish pantheon of demons was the Tsar and his regular pogroms against innocent Jews. However, try as one may, there is no academic authentication that such pogroms ever took place. In fact, western diplomats who investigated such allegations at the time found that the "massacre" stories were a pack of lies. Oxford University historian Goldwyn Smith found that British consuls visited the sites of alleged pogroms and found that nothing of the sort had taken place. What had happened was that Russian workers had rioted against Jewish money-lenders, and Tsarist troops were called in to quell the Russians, which they did. Various British diplomats in Russia at the time fully acknowledged that Jews were resented by the workers and peasants, not because of their creed, but because of their loan-sharking and sharp business practices.

American writers also noted the Jewish predilection for usury in Russia. Mark Twain had various scathing remarks to make. So too did Poultney Bigelow who wrote for *Harper's*. The Russian intellectuals also held that rampant Jewish capitalism was solely responsible for anti-Jewish feeling. Alexander Pushkin included several unattractive Jewish usurers in his works, as did the lesser known Nikolai Gogol and Dmitri Reshetnikov. A Russian authoress living in America, Zenaide Ragozin, attempted to present a correct perspective on the "pogrom" tales in the prestigious *Century Magazine* (April 1882). In a hard-to-find-work, *Diary of a Writer*, the famed Russian novelist Fyodor Dostoevsky wrote that "the Jews are draining the soil of Russia".

Of course, we cannot leave a survey of Jewish "persecution" in Tsarist Russia without mentioning the case of our dear friend Levi Davidovich Trotsky, or Bronstein to use his correct name. In his autobiography *My Life* he tells us that on his father's estate the workers received no shelter, no meat, and but 10 rubles a month for heavy labor. When they started to deteriorate physically his "father would give them some watermelons, or half a sack of dried fish, and they would go back to work again, often singing..." In the book *Trotsky* by Francis Wyndham and David King, we learn that Trotsky was so "persecuted" that he was sent off to a toney prep school in the Russian resort of Odessa. Plunging into the largely Jewish radical-chic fraternity life, Trotsky and company quickly set about hatching plots to redirect all that peasant resentment against Jewish capitalists into peasant resentment against the Tsar. When they finally

succeeded in having the Tsar deposed by popular unrest in the Spring of 1917, who should be waiting in the wings but Trotsky and his crowd of Jewish radicals. Several months later, the popular democratic government was overthrown by a tiny bunch of Jewish agitators, and Jewish power was finally in total control of the reins of power. Now they could set about **really** ripping off the Russian workers since there was no Tsar to apply a modicum of regulation. Deals were struck with wealthy Jewish capitalists in the west, such as Armand Hammer, whereby Russian minerals and Russian labor would be ruthlessly exploited for the mutual benefit of the Jewish capitalists in the west, and the Jewish state capitalists in the Soviet Union. What greater profit-base could there be than a country where the labor force was the captive of the government? The always-upward-socially-mobile Jewish landlords and loan sharks merely exchanged their snazzy civilian clothes for commissars' uniforms.

The "surviving" of Holocausts has become something of a Jewish tradition. There is no greater survival industry than that related to the 1933-1945 period, when 6,000,000 Jews are supposed to have been done to death by the Nazi government of Germany. Again, these claims have been scrupulously examined by academics such as Dr. Arthur Butz of Northwestern University at Chicago, and Dr. Robert Faurisson of the University of Lyon in France, and have been found to be unsupported. The California-based Institute for Historical Review publishes many books and a quarterly *Journal of Historical Review* which debunk such outlandish claims. Naturally, the IHR is the subject of much Jewish and Jewish-inspired opprobrium, as were those who expressed the slightest skepticism about earlier Jewish Holocaust claims.

In this Holocaust-to-end-all-Holocausts, the same features are evident as before. The similarity of "gas-chambers" and "gas-ovens" to Moloch's fiery statue, and to the burning of Shadrak, Meshak and Abednego, is uncanny. The exaggeration of casualty figures beyond the demographic possibilities is the same with the "Six Million" as it was with Bar Kokhba's "64 Million". The heavy lacing of the narratives with sexual and toiletry torments is synchronistic. We also find many references to rats and dogs eating Jewish flesh, which bring to mind the Biblical accounts of street dogs licking up the blood of Jezebel.

Let us examine a few of such narratives. *The New York Times* of 4 June 1974 reported on a Holocaust symposium held at the curious locale of St. John's Catholic Church in Manhattan. The reporter, Israel Shenker, recounted an entire "rap sheet" of Nazi crimes described at the symposium by survivors and by experts. The corpses of Jews were trundled to the ovens in wheelbarrows, he tells us. No water was available to prisoners — all had to "drink mud". Grandparents held hands with their children while "going into the ovens". "Hateful police dogs ate pieces of flesh alive" and rats too "ate up the cheeks of the bodies". Mud is often cited in psycho-analysis as a symbol for excreta. Walking into a horizontal crematory furnace is not physically possible, of course; the narrator is drawing on the Biblical imagery outlined earlier. Dogs and rats eating one's face is more likely the symptom of a deep neurosis than it is an empirical reality. One woman recounted:

*"Then they sent us to Birkenau, into the mud where there was fleas and dirt. We had no water at all. We drank mud. I had malaria; I had typhus; I had everything. But it happened that my heart kept on beating in spite of it... You don't manage to survive, it just happens. My brother died in the camp. My mother was sent to Auschwitz at the same time. I saw this big fire and I knew my mother's body was burning, and I was grateful that she should not have to see me burning in front of her or know that I saw her burning in front of me."*

Professor Irving Greenberg, of City University New York, also spoke about "burning" but in a more theological sense. He felt that Jews must philosophically learn to expect periods of belief *"interspersed with times when the flames and smoke of their burning children blot out faith, though it flickers again"*.

The symbol of the regeneration of Jewish life through the burning or other sacrificing of Jewish children is one that we have already encountered in our examination of ancient Jewish sacrificial offerings to the fertility goddess Ishtar, and the fire god Moloch. We also recall that when Shadrak, Meshak and Abednego were tossed into the fiery furnace by an enemy king, he was promptly astounded to discover not just the three Israelites walking around in the flames unscathed, but a fourth figure - the Jewish "son of God" - in there with them. We have seen the symbol recycled in the Talmudic accounts of Jewish children being burned in their own Torah scrolls by the Romans.

Almost every day, when one picks up a newspaper, one reads survivors' accounts of the Holocaust which include such Talmudic symbolism. In the University of Tulsa Collegian dated 11 February 1982 we read of a lecture by Jack Glocer, yet another survivor of Auschwitz, who says:

*"... he will never forget his work on the crew that was responsible for burying babies alive. It was not only the most inhumane thing ever done by this man who says 'I probably couldn't kill a chicken if I had to'. It also marked the only time he viewed a Nazi act with 'compassion'.*

*"'There was a Nazi sergeant guarding us as we buried live babies,' Glocer said in his Polish-accented English. 'All of a sudden he pulled a grenade from his belt and tossed it into the ditch. Then a superior officer walked by and told him that the next time he did something like that, disciplinary actions would be taken.'*

*"'I had a cousin who had a 3-month-old daughter on the train we took to Auschwitz,' Glocer remembers 'When we arrived at Auschwitz the child was grabbed by a Nazi soldier and thrown on top of a pile of burning babies.' "*

Other parts of the Talmud are recalled when we study various descriptions of "excremental assault", a survey of which appears in Terrence des Pres' thesis *The Survivor*.

*"Everybody in the block had typhus ... it came to Bergen-Belsen in its most violent, most painful, deadliest form. The diarrhea caused by it became uncontrollable. It flooded the bottom of the cages, dripping through the cracks into the faces of the women lying in the cages below, and mixed with blood, pus and urine, formed a slimy, fetid mud on the floor of the barracks."*

Here we go with "mud" again. About the only bodily emission that does not get a look in is semen; a vat of which Jesus was boiled in, according to the Talmud. The wicked Nazis even tormented their captives by providing only one latrine for "30,000 to 32,000 women". This inadequacy yet again caused the Jews to foul each other, for:

*"We stood in line to get into this tiny building, knee-deep in human excrement. As we all suffered from dysentery, we could rarely wait until our turn came, and soiled our ragged clothes, which never came off our bodies..."*

Even the luckier inmates, who worked in the camp hospital, "had to step into human excreta, into urine soaked with blood, into stools of patients suffering from highly contagious diseases". And:

*"Some of the patients died before they ever reached the gas chambers. Many of them were covered all over with excrement, for there were no sanitary facilities."*

Having just one latrine for all those 30,000+ prisoners apparently caused the inmates to resort to unconventional toilets.

*"Many women with diarrhea relieved themselves in soup bowls or the pans for coffee; then they hid the utensils under the mattress to avoid the punishment threatening them for doing so: 25 strokes on the bare buttocks, or kneeling all night long on sharp gravel, holding up bricks. These punishments often ended in the death of the guilty."*

Des Pres scoffs at attempts by (Jewish) psychoanalysts to describe the camp experience as a reversion to "infantile" or "anal fixated" levels. He explains that in a deprived environment it is only normal to focus totally on food and excretion. He points out that infants are not "forced to wet and soil themselves" whereas prisoners had no other choice. If they attempted to go to a proper lavatory, they would be attacked by guard dogs or assaulted by guards. He goes on to describe various depraved tortures that the guards would inflict. Prisoners would be forced to urinate into each other's mouths. Soup bowls would be tossed into latrines. At Buchenwald, "ten prisoners suffocated in excrement (pits) in October 1937 alone".

Unfortunately, none of these allegations stands up to scientific scrutiny. At Auschwitz today one can still see the remarkable recreation facilities provided for prisoners, including a swimming pool, a soccer field, a sports stadium, a volley-ball court and a theater. Hygiene was very strictly regulated, with all incoming internees being processed through a delousing facility that involved the fumigation of their clothes in fumigation closets (hence the so-called "gas chambers"). At various sites, British POWs were used to assist in the delousing processes. A report by one of the POWs appeared in the *Journal of the Royal Army Medical Corps* of September 1946. It is quite true that

later in the war there were serious outbreaks of typhus in many of the camps, but this was due to the breakdown of the delousing processes, and the general chaos caused by the Allied bombing campaigns. Evacuees were coming in from the east where typhus was endemic. Thousands of Germans, including camp staff, died of this disease. It was not something the Germans would **encourage** through inadequate hygiene — on the contrary it is something they would rigorously try to stamp out. Posters in German and Polish were posted everywhere advising of the fatal dangers of louse infestation.

One of the most telling cases of "survivor fantasy" is that of Kitty Hart, whose experiences as an inmate were described in the Yorkshire Television program *Kitty: Return to Auschwitz* shown on British television in November 1979, and on American PBS stations a year later. The TV dialog with her son at the remains of Auschwitz went like this:

"Kitty: 'If you didn't have your bowl, you didn't have your soup. If you didn't have your bowl, you didn't have your toilet, because your bowl was your toilet! You understand?'

"Son: 'How did you wash the bowl out...

"Kitty: 'You didn't!'

"Son: '... before you ate?'

"Kitty: 'I mean you didn't! You didn't! You didn't wash it out. That was ... that was your life ... your BOWL. MY BOWL. It was red.'

Later:

*"Now, I know, David you're seeing grass but I don't see any grass. I see mud. A SEA of MUD and, believe me, if there was one blade of grass, you know what would have happened? You'd have eaten it!"*

Then, just a little while later we find Kitty lying on a complete lawn of grass, this time seemingly resisting the impulse to start grazing:

"It was a glorious summer ... so during the day ... I sat here, on this lawn, sunbathing ... we were laughing and joking ... I was lying here and I was watching the crematoria over there. You saw the SS men, the extermination squad that did the actual killing, you know, the actual gassing. So, somewhere there was a ladder. You could see it when you were lying here ... and this SS man climbed up the ladder with a tin of gas which he had in his hand and through the skylight he just dropped in ... uh ... this tin and then he came down and off he went. And then a few seconds later you heard a sort of muffled sound, and those were people actually suffocating. And then, all of a sudden, it was very quiet and then, soon after that, you lay here and you could actually see smoke coming out of the chimney and those were the VERY people that were burning! And do you think I could believe that there were people actually burning in there? I couldn't

believe it. Can YOU believe it? NO! But people were burning there and you could HEAR them SCREAMING ... but you still couldn't believe it ... people were being sent in one end and there were ashes at the other end ten minutes later."

Kitty also reveals that she was one of those odd folk in Auschwitz who washed in her own urine. Throughout the film she continually returns to urine, mud, and bread. She is either bathing in urine, eating from her excrement-encrusted bowl, swimming in a sea of mud, eating mud, or eating mouthfuls of bread. We know right away that something is wrong. Asphyxiated, stone dead people do not scream when they are cremated. Bodies cannot be reduced to ashes in ten minutes (a more reasonable time would be 2-3 hours). And there are just too many self-contradictions in her story to make it the slightest bit plausible. If she would munch on one blade of grass in a sea of mud, how come she could sunbathe on an entire lawn? Kitty is sorely in need of some good counseling to determine the underlying causes of her fixations on anal functions. Perhaps her childhood toilet-training was too strict, and she subconsciously feels that opening her bowels without permission will lead to dire punishments like asphyxiation and burning.

Another "survivor" whose attic is full of junk is one Fania Fenelon, the subject of an American TV docudrama, *Playing for Time*. The TV production caused a storm of controversy because the anti-Zionist actress Vanessa Redgrave was cast in the lead role. In the case of Ms. Fenelon's book of the same title, we are only on page one of her narrative before she is telling us that:

*"A trick I'd found to cool myself was to wash in my own urine. Keeping myself clean was essential to me, and there is nothing unclean about urine. I could drink it if I was thirsty — and I had done so."*

With inmates going around drinking their own urine and using their soup dishes as toilets it would hardly be surprising that Auschwitz suffered from epidemics of disease. But it is rather more likely that these "narratives" are largely based on fantasy.

Many of these survivors' accounts have appeared on the pulp paper-back market over the years. In the early 1950s there was a vogue for such material, but this had largely died out by the 1970s. However, the increased use of the "Holocaust" as justification for Israeli imperialism and exemption from normal moral criteria brought about a revival in the market. The showing of the television docu-drama *Holocaust* did much to heighten interest, and of course the Zionists were quick to use the opportunity to draw attention to the alleged correlation between the Nazi Holocaust and the existence of a Jewish theocratic colony in the mid-East. Many survivors sought to jump on the bandwagon and by 1980 there were scores of "personal testimonies" flooding the bookstores. None of these were of an academic nature, and some of them were downright fiction from beginning to end. But still one could detect the same symbols and the same neuroses exhibiting themselves. One particularly trashy novel of the era was *Eyewitness Auschwitz: Three Years in the Gas Chambers* by Filip Müller. Müller's book is full of low-budget horror-movie material that would be laughed out of court in any test of



authenticity. He claims that SS doctors would examine victims while they they were still alive, and once they were gassed, would slice off bits of flesh for experiments; the flesh jumping around in buckets. He claims to have waded through pits of decomposing corpses, which oozed up out of the ground one hot summer. On one page, a female gassee does a striptease to distract attention. During the mayhem, Müller gets locked into the gas chamber, but "miraculously" escapes. On a later page, the chief gasser Moll gets sexually turned on — as does his dog — with the killing of another beautiful young gassee. Müller gets transferred again to the pits for burning excess corpses. Here he defies science by burning corpses without oxygen getting to them underneath, and by basting them in their melted fat.

It is not therefore surprising that some of the more respectable peddlers of the Holocaust cult, known generally as Exterminationists have attempted to save face by condemning certain of the more extreme and outlandish claims. In *The Final Solution*, Gerald Reitlinger advises that:

*"A certain degree of reserve is necessary in handling all of this material, and particularly this applies to the last section (survivor narratives)... The Eastern European Jew is a natural rhetorician, speaking in flowery similes ... who use numerals as oratorical adjectives and whose very names are creations of fantasy."*

In her book *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, Hannah Arendt reports that the prosecution:

"...had been under considerable pressure from Israeli survivors, who constitute about 20% of the present population of the country. They had flocked spontaneously to the trial authorities ... to offer themselves as witnesses. The worst cases of 'strong imagination', people who had 'seen Eichmann at various places where he had never been', were weeded out, but 56 'sufferings-of-the-Jewish-people witnesses', as the trial authorities called them, were finally put on the stand, instead of some 15 or 20 'background witnesses' as originally planned.

"If Eichmann's name was mentioned at all, it obviously was hearsay evidence, 'rumors testified to', hence without legal validity. The testimony of all witnesses who had 'seen him with their own eyes' collapsed the moment a question was addressed to them."

In a remarkable climb-down in the British *New Statesman* of 2 November 1979, Exterminationist scholar Gitta Sereny admits:

"It is true that, along with many authentic works, there have been books or films which were only partly true, or even were partly faked. And unfortunately, even reputable historians often fail in their care... By quoting supposed 'eyewitnesses' who are in fact repeating hearsay, (Martin) Gilbert perpetuates errors which — because they are so easily disproved — provide Revisionists' opportunities...

"This is an area in which commercially motivated rubbish can have terrible long-term consequences. The problem with books like this is that they are 'ghosted' by

professional wordsmiths ... who have neither interest in nor capacity for conveying truth with restraint.

"Worse again are the partial or complete fakes such as Jean Francis Steiner's *Treblinka* or Martin Gray's *For Those I Loved*. Steiner's book on the surface even seems right: he is a man of talent and conviction, and it is hard to know how he could go so wrong. But what he finally produced was a hodgepodge of truth and falsehood, libeling both the dead and the living. The original French book had to be withdrawn and reissued with all the names changed. But it retains its format of imagined conversations and reactions — i.e. pure fiction — incredibly remaining nonetheless, in serious bibliographies.

Gray's *For Those I Loved* was the work of Max Gallo the ghost-writer ... I myself told Gray ... that he had manifestly never been to, nor escaped from, Treblinka. He finally asked, despairingly: 'But does it matter? Wasn't the only thing that Treblinka did happen, that it should be written about, and that some Jews should be shown to have been heroic?'"

In the same article, Ms. Sereny admits that:

"Auschwitz, despite its emblematic name, was **not** primarily an extermination camp for Jews, and is not the central case through which to study extermination policy."

In a lengthy letter to the *Los Angeles Times* of 16 May 1981, Professor Deborah Lipstadt of UCLA History Department writes:

*"The fact is that the Nazis never used the bodies of Jews, or for that matter anyone else, for the production of soap. The soap rumor was prevalent both during and after the war. It may have had its origin in the cadaver factory atrocity story that came out of World War I. The letters 'RJF' probably stood for the name of the factory that produced soap. The soap rumor was thoroughly investigated after the war and proved to be untrue."*

In an article in *Judaism* of October 1981, the same professor condemns the increased "commercialization" of the Holocaust. She warns that the separation of the Holocaust from the Jewish "historical continuum" is dangerous. She charges that Jewish leaders not only draw on the "articulated sense of guilt that afflicts many of those who survived" but that they even try to create more guilt in order to make their flock "more pliable and responsive".

However, all of this clutching at reality is beyond the intellectual ability of Elie Wiesel, Chairman of the President's Commission (now Council) on the Holocaust. In his 1980 *Report to the President* he described in much detail his neuroses:

"Why then cling to unbearable memories that may for ever rob us of our sleep? Why not forget, turn the page, and proclaim: let it remain buried deep beneath the dark nightmares of our subconscious. Why not spare our children the weight of our collective

burden and allow them to start their lives free of nocturnal obsessions and complexes, free of Auschwitz and its shadows?"

Naturally, he immediately goes on to explain why we should suffer eternal insomnia: According to Wiesel, the survivors, "... willingness to share their knowledge, their pain, their anguish, even their agony, is motivated solely by their conviction that their survival was for a purpose. A survivor sees himself as a messenger and guardian of secrets entrusted by the dead."

Yet again, the one crime that has visited and revisited Jewish children with monotonous regularity over the eons is described:

*"... in order to cut expenses and save gas, cost-accountant considerations led to an order to place living children directly into the ovens, or throw them into open burning pits."*

And yet again, the "Holocaust kingdom" is described in terms of *"charred souls ... darkness ... flames of darkness ... fire ... ashes ... and torture..."*

And, right near the end of his *Report*, a double-double whammy:

"Little did we know that Jewish children would again be murdered, in cold blood, by killers in Israel."

Yet another survivor in the same mold, who obviously has not been keeping up with all the revisions that are being made to Holocaust theory by the leading Exterminationists themselves, is one Mel Mermelstein, author of *By Bread Alone*. Mermelstein is the "survivor" who in 1981 sued the Institute for Historical Review for their \$50,000 reward for proof of "gas chambers". Yet again, burnt offerings are sent to the heavens:

"I turned my head trying to dismiss the picture of the smoking chimneys and the fires below them, but the vision did not leave. It became worse inside me when I realized that at the very moment my mother, Etu, Magda, Angel, and my playmate Karen, might be in there, consumed by the flames. I looked up. I could barely see the sky. The picture became real. I screamed."

Later:

"Suddenly the road burst upon the scene — a scene right out of Dante's Inferno. Ahead were three huge pits dug deep into the ground. In each a fire was raging. Around the flaming pits, naked men were running in an endless circle. All around I could see SS guards and prison kapos swinging their leather whips and driving the prisoners from behind into the pits.. I kept pushing myself away from the pit but something kept drawing me back. I was torn between two worlds, the living and the dead. I pushed my way closer to the edge of the pit. My God, I could see humans on fire, writhing and moaning."

Again, there is no evidence whatsoever that the Germans engaged in any practice of immolating living persons. No documents. No photographs. No evidence that would stand up in court. All we have are the alleged eye-witness reports of people like Mermelstein. And we have seen in the Eichmann case, and in a multitude of other "war crimes" trials, that eyewitness testimony in such cases is grossly unreliable. Every witness wants to be a star witness, regardless of the truth. At least we ought to be grateful that Mermelstein spares us the lurid details of sexual and toiletry nightmares.

Last but not least, we come to the present day turmoil in Israeli occupied Palestine. Here again, we find exactly the same symbolism in play. A report in the *Los Angeles Times* dated 26 August 1979 describes the trial in Israel of two PLO members, who allegedly attacked a civilian bus. According to the report, the two Arabs "showed signs of having been beaten. One's arm was in a cast, the other's face was cut and had a black eye. Mrs. Tsemel (defense counsel) said prison guards had beaten them."

The defense lawyer was harangued by both the prosecution witnesses and by the spectators. "You sold out your country, you bitch, for PLO money" screamed one. Yet again, the witnesses drew on the usual imagery:

*"When the girl terrorist grabbed a baby and threw it into a burning seat, he started to clap. Then I saw him shoot the boy and a man with glasses who said one word to him in Arabic."*

More abuse was heaped on the defense lawyers:

*"One of the male survivors of the massacre shouted at Mrs. Tsemel, with whom he had gone to school. 'Your day will come too, Leah. Your children should burn as others did.'"*

Yes indeed. **Your children should burn as others did.** What is it about the sacred rite of child sacrifice through immolation that purges the Jewish soul? Are the Jews ridding themselves of some hereditary hang-up, or are they providing themselves with a rationale to feel guilty for the rest of their lives? Or might it not be that when his children are sacrificed as a burnt offering unto God, the Jew is vicariously destroying part of himself? Are the Jews so self-hating that they seek the destruction of their own progeny?

---

***Free receipt, possession, dissemination, discussion and transmission of this document (or documents contained in this collection or archive) are all hereby claimed and maintained as under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;***

***including (but not limited to) those following:***

## **From the Universal Declaration of Human Rights**

### ***Article Twelve of the Universal Declaration***

- 1. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation.**
- 2. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.**

### ***Article Eighteen of the Universal Declaration***

**Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.**

### ***Article Nineteen of the Universal Declaration***

**Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.**

## ***FAIR USE NOTICE***

*This site contains copyrighted material, the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available in our efforts to advance understanding of environmental, political, human rights, economic, scientific, and social justice issues etc.*

### **US LAW**

We believe that our use of any such copyrighted material constitutes a 'fair use' as provided for in section 107 of the US Copyright Law. In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, the material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for research and educational purposes. For more information go to: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.shtml>.

### **EU LAW**

As regards the use of copyrighted material within the European Union. The [European Directive 2001/29/EC](#) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 May 2001 on the harmonisation of certain aspects of copyright and related rights in the information society provides in its art. 5 an exhaustive list of exemptions that can be implemented by the Member States.

Amongst that list, the exemption(s) invoked must cover the reproduction and communication to the public (since the publication on the Internet implies those two acts). Generally, exemptions will be based on the purpose of the intended use. For instance, the Directive provides for an exemption to the exclusive right of reproduction and communication to the public when it is made ***for the sole purpose of illustration for teaching or scientific research, as long as the source, including the author's name, is indicated, unless this turns out to be impossible and to the extent justified by the non-commercial purpose to be achieved.***

Another exemption is “reproduction by the press, ***communication to the public or making available of published articles on current economic, political or religious topics or of broadcast works or other subject-matter of the same character, in cases where such use is not expressly reserved, and as long as the source, including the author's name, is indicated, or use of works or other subject-matter in connection with the reporting of current events, to the extent justified by the informatory purpose and as long as the source, including the author's name, is indicated, unless this turns out to be impossible***”.

All the exceptions must comply with the three step test which imply that exemptions must only apply in certain special cases (1) which do not conflict with a normal exploitation of the work or other subject-matter (2) and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the rightholder (3).

If you wish to use copyrighted material from this site for purposes of your own that go beyond 'fair use', you must obtain permission from the copyright owner.